

**REPORT OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

**Local Department of Social Services  
Funding Requests for Renovating  
Existing Space, Relocating or  
Constructing New Space**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 63**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
RICHMOND  
2006**



# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

## DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

### *Office of the Commissioner*

Anthony Conyers, Jr.  
COMMISSIONER

November 1, 2006

#### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** The Honorable Marilyn B. Tavenner  
Secretary of Health and Human Resources

Richard D. Brown, Director  
Department of Planning and Budget

**FROM:** Anthony Conyers, Jr. *Anthony Conyers Jr.*

**SUBJECT:** Local Reimbursement Requests for Office Space

This report is submitted pursuant to Item 342 E of the 2006 Appropriation Act (the Act) which directs the Commissioner of the Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS), in consultation with relevant state and local social service agencies, to develop a prioritized list of local requests for increased state reimbursement for renovating existing space, relocating or constructing new space. This initial assessment of local space needs will be updated annually based on input from local departments of social services (LDSS) and forwarded in accordance with language outlined in the Act.

Selecting and evaluating office space criteria for 120 local departments requires consideration of varied business and office characteristics. This report represents a systematic, quantitative approach to gathering, analyzing and prioritizing these space needs utilizing 25 variables. It was developed by VDSS staff after reviewing similar tools used by the Departments of Health and General Services, and incorporating requirements of the Act.

Collaboration between VDSS, other State agencies, and local departments will continue as model variables are refined and enhanced to better reflect local needs. This report is a first step to quantify and prioritize funding requirements for local space needed to address growing caseloads and increasing program complexity at the local service delivery level.

AC/js

c: The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Jr., Chairman  
House Appropriations Committee  
The Honorable John H. Chichester, Chairman  
Senate Finance Committee

## **PREFACE**

Over the past fifteen to twenty years, local department of social services (LDSS) office space funding increases have been sporadic despite rising costs, and increasing needs. There has not been a systematic approach to dealing with the increasing costs for space or funding provided for increasing space needs. Consequently, local officials have made individual requests through their elected state representatives for additional funds to meet local departments' space needs.

The 2006 Appropriation Act Item 342 E (the Act) requires the Commissioner of the Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS), in consultation with relevant state and local social service agencies, to develop a prioritized list of local requests for increased state reimbursement for renovating existing space, relocating or constructing new space. By systematically assessing statewide requests, the General Assembly will be better positioned to address the needs of local departments.

After considering space data collection and analysis tools used by the Departments of General Services and Health, VDSS staff and representatives of the Virginia League of Social Services Executives (the League) Administrative Committee developed a space data collection model to meet the report mandate. This model includes key variables outlined in the Act, employed by other State agencies in space allocation and funding processes, and developed by VDSS staff and League Administrative Committee representatives.

This initial report of prioritized local department space needs will be updated annually as required by the Act. The process and methods used to develop the prioritized listing are described herein.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

❖ Executive Summary.....	i
❖ Report Mandate.....	1
❖ Background.....	1 - 5
○ General information	
○ Reimbursement – the process and amounts	
○ State regulations, policies, and prior studies	
○ Federal regulations and guidelines	
❖ Methodology.....	5 - 7
○ Mandate	
○ Development Team	
○ Existing methods	
○ Model development	
○ Data collection	
○ Data analysis	
❖ Results.....	7
○ Summary	
○ Total score variables	
○ Agency size/classification	
○ Square footage	
○ Overall priority	
❖ Recommendations and Conclusion.....	8
○ Recommendations of local reimbursement priority	
○ Conclusion and funding flexibility	
❖ Appendix	
○ Appendix A: VDSS Commissioner Funding Request for Space Needs	
○ Appendix B: VDSS Space Needs Data Collection	
○ Appendix C: Initial Report Development Team	
○ Appendix D: Prioritized List of Local Space Needs	
○ Appendix E: Prioritized List by Agency Classification	
○ Appendix F: LDSS Supplemental Request Information	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains a prioritized list of projects requiring funding in local departments. The report was developed as directed by the Act in an effort to more systematically evaluate funding requests made by local departments through their elected state representatives. The list was compiled using a data collection model developed by VDSS with support from the League Administrative Committee. The data collection tool was developed considering guidance provided in the Act, similar tools used by the Departments of Health and General Services, and input from VDSS and League core team members.

Clearly, a systematic approach to addressing space needs in local departments is greatly needed. Over the past decade, there have been six instances where funding was provided to a specific locality through General Assembly member amendments or other state budget means. There was also one case where a total of \$1.8M in state and federal funds was appropriated to address local department space needs. In selected localities, local funds have been used to meet local departments' space needs.

The information contained in this report is prospective in nature. We were not asked nor have we attempted to make the case that past local investments in space should be reimbursed to a locality. In some cases, localities may argue that they are being penalized if they determined ways to solve local department space needs without state or federal assistance. Appendix F presents information from localities not directly addressed in the data collection process to allow them an opportunity to get their specific local experience on record.

This report prioritizes local space needs based on a set of quantitative measures. Ratings of local department space were completed at the local level based on the model discussed previously. The raw data received were then normalized for scoring disparities and weighted based on criteria agreed to by VDSS and the League Administrative Committee.

The prioritized listing of local department space needs is presented at Appendix D. In general terms, local department space costs are covered by a mix of approximately 40 percent state, 40 percent federal and 20 percent local funds. The total cost of this recommendation would be approximately \$2M including \$800K in state general funds.

In addition, VDSS recommends that funding be considered in the amount of \$1M to address the costs of space increases either absorbed previously at the expense of other administrative funding requirements or increases anticipated in the current year. These funds would be distributed to all local departments expressing needs in the data collection process. At the 40/40/20 ratio described above, state general funds of \$400K would be needed to meet this requirement.

## REPORT MANDATE

The 2006 Appropriation Act, Item 342 E states:

*The Commissioner of Social Services, in consultation with relevant state and local agencies, shall develop proposed criteria for assessing funding requests for addressing space needs among local departments of social services, as well as proposed consolidated human services buildings. The criteria shall include but not be limited to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, access to public transportation, life safety issues, condition of current space and related major building systems, impact on service delivery, and other factors as may be appropriate. The Department shall use the criteria to prioritize local requests for increased state reimbursement for renovating existing space, relocating or constructing new space. The Department shall forward a prioritized list of projects to the Secretary of Health and Human Resources and the Department of Planning and Budget by November 1 of each year for consideration by the Governor in the development of the budget. The Department shall also submit a copy of the list of prioritized projects by November 1, 2006, to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees.*

## BACKGROUND

### ❖ General information

- Virginia is one of 12 states that operate under a state supervised, locally administered social service delivery system.
- There are 120 local departments with separate VDSS budgets that build, maintain, rent, and/or operate office facilities at the discretion of and under their local governments and local social services boards.

### ❖ Reimbursement – the process and amounts

- Funding sources for applicable LDSS office space requests include:
  - Local funds
  - State general funds via VDSS
  - Federal funds via VDSS
- VDSS submits allowable local department and VDSS costs to the appropriate federal cognizant agency to obtain federal financial participation (FFP) available via federal grants.

- VDSS reimburses local departments monthly for administrative and program expenditures incurred the previous month.
  - Local department administrative costs include, but are not limited to, those for applicable local office space.
  - All local costs must be allowable, reasonable and necessary as stipulated in local, state and federal regulations, plans, and policies governing office space, building codes and office standards.
  - Local departments have two primary reimbursement options from VDSS:
    - Option #1: General administrative.
      - Reimbursement rates for this are approximately 40 percent federal, 40 percent state, and 20 percent local.
      - Due to funding and budget considerations, these funds may not cover all administrative costs for local departments.
    - Option #2: “Pass-Through” administrative.
      - Reimbursement rates for this option are approximately 40 percent federal, 0 percent state, and 60 percent local.
      - This is the primary option used by local departments to obtain additional funds after funds are depleted in Option #1.
      - Expenses are only reimbursed based on available federal funds.
      - Some localities cannot afford to cover the significant local match commitment of 60 percent which prohibits some local departments from taking advantage of this option.
  - From the 1997 General Assembly Session through 2006, there have been six cases where specific local departments were provided additional funds to assist with their office space costs.
  - The most recent statewide allocation of additional funds to local departments for rent occurred in fiscal year 2000 as a result of 1999 General Assembly actions. Approximately \$1.8M in state and federal funds was provided in FY 2000 to be used statewide to assist with rental costs.

❖ State regulations, policies, and prior studies (specific office space references are highlighted)

○ Code of Virginia for local reimbursements:

- § 63.2-400. *Local appropriation. The governing body of each county and city shall each year appropriate sums of money sufficient to provide for the payment of public assistance and to provide social services, including cost of administration, under the provisions of Subtitles II and III of this title, within such county or city.....*
- § 63.2-401. *Reimbursement of localities by the Commonwealth. Such funds as are received from the United States and agencies thereof as grants-in-aid for the purpose of providing public assistance and social services grants shall be paid monthly by the Commissioner to each county, city or district fiscal officer as reimbursement of the federal share of such grants as have been paid by each county and city under the provisions of Subtitle II and III of this title. Within the limits of the appropriations of state funds, the Commissioner shall reimburse the entire balance of such public assistance and social services grants as have been paid by each city, county or district fiscal officer after crediting them with the reimbursement made from federal funds.....*

*Administrative expenditures made by the localities in connection with the providing of public assistance grants, other benefits and related social services, including child welfare pursuant to § [63.2-319](#), shall be ascertained by the Board, and the Commissioner shall, within the limits of available federal funds and state appropriations, reimburse monthly each county, city or district fiscal officer therefore out of such federal and state funds in an amount to be determined by the Board not less than fifty percent of such administrative costs.*

***The Commissioner also shall reimburse monthly, to the extent funds are available for such purpose, each county, city or district fiscal officer out of state and federal funds, to the extent provided in the preceding paragraph, for monthly rental payments for office space provided the local department in publicly owned buildings, for payments that are based on the cost of initial construction or purchase of a building or a reasonable amount for depreciation of such building, and for the cost of repairs and alterations to either a privately or publicly owned building. However, no monthly rental payment shall exceed a reasonable amount as determined by the Commissioner.***

*Claims for reimbursement shall be presented by the local board to the Commissioner, and shall be itemized and verified in such manner as the Commissioner may require. Such claim shall, upon the approval of the Commissioner, be paid out of funds appropriated by the Commonwealth and funds received from the federal government for the purposes of Subtitles II and III of this title, to the treasurer or other fiscal officer of the county or city.....*



- State plans
  - VDSS submits several state plans for federal approval when federal funds are used.
  - State plans are either program or financially based and must indicate and explain activities and/or administrative costs that will be covered, including those covering office space.
- State policies and prior studies
  - The Department of General Services (DGS) has established policies and procedures that are applicable **only** to state departments, agencies and institutions.
  - The State Board of Social Services approved LDSS office space policies and procedures in November 1977. These standards are currently out of date and rarely used; however, some localities still refer to them.
  - “A Study of Office Space in Local Departments of Social Services” was conducted in 1996 by VDSS. It found a state funding deficit; however no funds were directly appropriated from this study.
- ❖ Federal regulations and guidelines (specific office space references are highlighted)
  - Federal regulations applicable to office space costs:
    - In general, federal guidance assumes that state policies and standards are followed to ensure allowable costs.
    - OMB Circular A-87
      - *Establishes principles for determining the allowable costs incurred by State, local, and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments (governmental units) under grants, cost reimbursement contracts, and other agreements with the Federal Government (collectively referred to in this Circular as "Federal awards").*
      - **This OMB circular covers different areas of costs including depreciation, interest, and rental costs.**  
*Attachment B, item 38. Rental costs.*
        - a. ....rental costs are allowable to the extent that the rates are reasonable in light of such factors as: rental costs of comparable property, if any; market conditions in the area; alternatives available; and, the type, life expectancy, condition, and value of the property leased.*
        - b. Rental costs under sale and leaseback arrangements are allowable only up to the amount that would be allowed had the governmental unit*

*continued to own the property.*

*c. Rental costs under less-than-arms-length leases are allowable only up to the amount that would be allowed had title to the property vested in the governmental unit. ....*

*d. Rental costs under leases which are required to be treated as capital leases under GAAP are allowable only up to the amount that would be allowed had the governmental unit purchased the property on the date the lease agreement was executed. This amount would include expenses such as depreciation or use allowance, maintenance, and insurance. ...*

- Other federal sources governing costs:
  - *Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Public Welfare and Human Services,*
    - *Part 92--Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, Scope: This part establishes uniform administrative rules for Federal grants and cooperative agreements and subawards to State, local and Indian tribal governments.*

## **METHODOLOGY**

- ❖ 2006 General Assembly Session
  - Item 342 E of the Act was adopted by the General Assembly requiring VDSS to prepare a prioritized list of local office space reimbursement requests.
  - The mandate stipulated some of the variables that should be used by VDSS.
  - Refer to the “Mandate” section of this report for full actual language.
- ❖ May 2006: A core team was created
  - The VDSS Commissioner requested that the VDSS Chief Financial Officer (CFO) comply with the requirements of the mandate.
  - The CFO organized a core team comprised of other VDSS staff and League Administrative Committee representatives.
  - Refer to Appendix C for the list of core team members.
- ❖ June - July 2006: Existing methods were analyzed and assessed
  - The core team researched, discussed, and reviewed existing models and studies.
  - The 1996 office space study conducted by VDSS titled “A Study of Office Space in Local Departments of Social Services” was reviewed and considered. One of the authors of this study is a current core team member.
  - Other methods of collecting local space data were researched.
  - The existing Virginia Department of General Services (DGS) office space procedures implemented August 2006 were reviewed, discussed and considered.

- The existing Virginia Department of Health (VDH) office space model was reviewed and discussed.
- ❖ July – August 2006: The VDSS model for achieving the mandate was developed
  - VDSS structured its model after the VDH model using many of the same evaluation variables.
  - Selected variables from within the Act were also used.
  - Other variables were added based on input from core team members.
  - Refer to Appendix B “Space Needs Data Collection” for a list of variables requested and explanations.
  - The variables were discussed with the full League Administrative Committee. A methodology for assigning weights for each variable and category was developed in concert with the League Administrative Committee.
- ❖ September - October 2006: Gathered local data for model
  - A memorandum dated August 30, 2006 from the VDSS Commissioner was sent to all Local Directors announcing mandate and need for request information.
    - Refer to Appendix A
  - A memorandum dated September 8, 2006 from the VDSS CFO was sent to all Local Directors requesting local space data based on specific questions and instructions.
    - Refer to Appendix B
  - The VDSS CFO sent a memorandum to Local Directors on September 25, 2006 reminding them of the upcoming deadline.
  - A call campaign was initiated on September 28 to local departments that had not responded to ensure local departments were aware of the upcoming October 2, 2006 deadline.
  - Some local departments were provided additional time, with October 11, 2006 being the absolute deadline for input.
- ❖ October 2006: Local department data was analyzed
  - An analysis worksheet was prepared that incorporated all data elements for the variables by local departments.
  - Raw scores were established based on variable scores submitted by local departments.
  - Scores were normalized so that a variable with two possible responses was given the same consideration as a variable with five possible responses.
  - Total scores were computed using the weighting criteria assigned to both the variables and the categories.
  - Priorities were assessed and determined.
    - Refer to the “Appendix” section of this report for several result selections.
    - The final priority list recommended by VDSS considered relative computed values, demographic information, and all other information provided by local departments.
    - Appendix F contains additional information submitted by some local departments. This option was provided to capture input from local departments for issues not considered adequately addressed in the data collection tool.

- ❖ October 2006: Prepared the report
  - This report was prepared and reviewed by all core team members.
  - Appendix D contains the prioritized list of local department space needs.
  - Appendix E presents a prioritized listing of local department space needs based on their agency classification.

## **RESULTS**

Conducting the study necessary to compile this report validates the need for a systematic approach to addressing local department office space needs. A number of local departments are in need of assistance in addressing space needs. We were informed by some localities that staff morale was adversely impacted by their work spaces. Other local departments indicated staff were leaving and/or turning down jobs as a result of the conditions of their work spaces. Clearly, there is a need to begin to work to resolve space issues in local departments.

We received responses from 94 local departments. Our data collection model asked that a separate submission be made for each local department facility. We received input from the localities mentioned above indicating a total of 34 additional facilities were in use. We did not receive responses from 26 local departments. Those local departments that did not respond are identified in alphabetical order at the end of the prioritized listing. We read their failure to respond after numerous reminders to mean those local departments do not have space needs at this time.

The normalized, weighted scores range from a low of 1,808 to a high of 5,574. The higher scores represent local departments with the greatest need based on the current study. The average score was 3,342. The median score was 3,282. Approximately one-third of the localities reporting indicated they were integrated or co-located with other human services agencies. Thirteen other agencies indicated they were planning to integrate their facilities with other human service agencies.

A prioritized list of local space needs is provided at Appendix D. Appendix E presents a prioritized list by local department agency classification. The classification is a function of the size of the local department. Since the identified needs are significant, an incremental approach to addressing local department space needs seems prudent. Our recommendations are presented as a way by which local space issues can best be addressed over time.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

VDSS offers two recommendations based on the information derived from the local space study. The first is to begin to address local space issues through an incremental approach. We recommend funding be considered to address local department space issues for the thirty local facilities with the highest relative need. The total cost to cover this recommendation would be \$2M which includes \$800K in state general funds.

The second recommendation results from cost increases at the local level that are projected for the current year just to maintain the status quo. In most local departments, office space costs increase annually due to lease agreements. Other cost increases are driven by increases in program activities requiring additional space. In past years, increases in costs for local space have been covered by decreasing costs in other administrative areas, most significantly funds for staff. To start to address this issue, it is recommended that \$1M be considered to cover local space requirements documented during the course of developing this report. This amount includes \$400K in state general funds.

## **CONCLUSION**

Funds are needed in local departments across the Commonwealth to address local space needs. This funding requirement has not been addressed systematically in a number of years. To provide appropriate facilities to ensure the safety and well being of local department staff and customers, an infusion of funds is required. At the state level, every four dollars committed results in approximately ten dollars in funds available to address local department space needs. Providing funds to meet the recommendations outlined above will be a first step in beginning to address local department space issues.

**APPENDIX A**  
**VDSS Commissioner Conyers**  
**Funding Requests for Space Needs**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 30, 2006

TO: All Local Directors

FROM: Anthony Conyers, Jr., Commissioner

SUBJECT: Funding Requests for Space Needs

CONTACT: Don Rainey (804) 726-7177 [donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov)  
Rusty Jordan (757) 405-1869 [rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us](mailto:rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us)  
J.R. Simpson (804) 726-7204 [j\\_r.simpson@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:j_r.simpson@dss.virginia.gov)

The 2006 Virginia Acts of Assembly, Chapter Three, Item 342E includes the following language –

“The Commissioner of Social Services, in conjunction with relevant state and local agencies, shall develop proposed criteria for assessing funding requests for addressing space needs among local departments of social services, as well as proposed consolidated human services buildings. The criteria shall include but not be limited to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, access to public transportation, life safety issues, condition of current space and related major building systems, impact on service delivery, and other factors as may be appropriate. The Department shall use the criteria to prioritize local requests for increased state reimbursement for renovating existing space, relocating or constructing new space. The Department shall forward a prioritized list of projects to the Secretary of Health and Human Resources and the Department of Planning and Budget by November 1 of each year for consideration by the Governor in the development of the budget. The Department shall also submit a copy of the list of prioritized projects by November 1, 2006, to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees.”

This issue was discussed in the state wide video teleconference on August 10, 2006 and with the Virginia League of Social Services’ Admin Committee on August 18, 2006. The League Admin Committee agreed to have Rusty Jordan, Portsmouth Director, work with Don Rainey, Director of General Services for the Virginia Department of Social Services, on the plan to gather appropriate data and write the initial report. This is most helpful as Rusty was involved in the last such effort to compile similar information in the late 1990s.

The project is moving forward. Don Rainey has obtained similar data gathering and rating instruments from the state Departments of General Services and Health. Working with Rusty, he is considering the appropriate data elements to be included in the document based on the guidance provided in the Act highlighted above. Our goal is to be completely objective and rely on quantitative data in developing the prioritized list of projects to be submitted in the report.

In early September, we will forward a request for information to you based on the data collecting tool under development. We will be asking for a turnaround of thirty days or so to allow time for compiling data, prioritizing requirements, and preparing the report. Please note, the language in the Act is prospective and does not provide a course for addressing changes or improvements made to local facilities in the past. We trust that by working together we can start to effect improvements to space available to local departments of social services.

Please contact Don Rainey, Rusty Jordan, J.R. Simpson or me if additional information is required or desired.

**APPENDIX B**  
**VDSS CFO J.R. SIMPSON**  
**SPACE NEEDS DATA COLLECTION**

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 8, 2006

TO: All Local Directors

FROM: J.R. Simpson, Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: Space Needs Data Collection

CONTACT: Don Rainey (804) 726.7177 or [donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov)  
Rusty Jordan (757) 405.1869 or [rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us](mailto:rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us)  
J. R. Simpson (804) 726.7204 or [j.r.simpson@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:j.r.simpson@dss.virginia.gov)

Greetings!

Last week, the Commissioner provided notification that we would be asking for your assistance in gathering data to fulfill a new reporting requirement outlined in the current Appropriations Act under Item 342E. The most favorable outcome would be that additional funding would be made available to assist Local Departments of Social Services with space needs. The data request is attached, but first a little background.

In developing the data collection tool, we considered the language in the Appropriations Act, a similar tool used by the Department of Health for local offices, and a tool used by the Department of General Services for state owned buildings. We are sure this tool is not perfect, but we think it is a good first effort in collecting data required to prioritize the space needs of Local Departments. We developed the data request in conjunction with the League Admin Committee and are most appreciative of their assistance. We welcome your suggestions for improvements in future years.

The spreadsheet you will find at the first tab labeled "Local Demographics" provides us with basic administrative data and will not be used in the prioritization process. The second tab labeled "Facility Rating Worksheet," will be used in the prioritization of need process. We have tried to be clear on conditions that warrant specific scores, but if we have failed in our effort, please use your best judgment. Of course, you are welcome to call one of the contacts identified above with questions. Please remember we are trying to identify those Local Departments with the most intense needs as you respond to these questions.

Please return completed spreadsheets to Don Rainey at [Donald.Rainey@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:Donald.Rainey@dss.virginia.gov) by Monday, October 2, 2006. We will use the time between October 2 and November 1 to compile the data, draft the report, and obtain necessary reviews. If you are able to respond earlier, that



would be sincerely appreciated. If you find yourself needing a little more time, please contact us and we will work with you. We must have all data in hand no later than Monday, October 9, 2006 to complete the report on time.

We look forward to developing and submitting this initial report with your assistance and collaboration. The League Admin Committee and Rusty Jordan, Portsmouth Local Social Services Director, as their representative has worked closely with us to this point. We want the end product to be one we all support as that provides our best chance of success in obtaining additional state funds for this critical need. Since this will be an annual report, if your locality is not near the top this time around, it should work its way to the top as funding is made available.

Please print the following pages entitled Attachment A and B and also both worksheets of the attached e-mailed spreadsheet. These two documents were prepared with the intention of assisting with the completion of the Demographic and Rating worksheets. Attachment A contains instructions for completing the attached spreadsheets. Attachment B is a scoring legend prepared to assist in ensuring scoring across the state is as consistent as possible. We anticipate site visits to localities indicating the greatest need from this data collection effort. We also plan to include pictures in the report to help illustrate the need for additional funding for social services facilities.

Please contact me if additional information is required or desired! Thank you very much!

**Step by Step Instructions for Completing the  
Local Demographic and Facility Rating Spreadsheets**

**Local Demographic Worksheet:**

- 1) Please record requested information in the appropriate field. This information will not be used as part of the scoring process, but will provide necessary demographic information for submission in the report. The field requesting your estimated facility cost increase is your best estimate of the annual cost to upgrade your present facility or secure a more suitable facility. We are looking for the estimated annual increase above what you are currently paying.

**Facility Rating Worksheet:**

- 1) Please use Attachment B, the Facility Rating Worksheet Legend, as your guide to assess your facilities. If you have more than one facility, please provide additional information in the space provided to the right.
- 2) There are six areas in which information **MUST** be provided to complete the assessment. Some of these areas have been broken down into subsections in order to capture more information. These areas are:
  - a. ADA Compliance
  - b. Public Transportation
  - c. Life Safety (Sprinkler System, Fire Alarm, Security System, Building Egress, and Asbestos)
  - d. Current Space Conditions (Furnishings, Lighting, Conference Rooms, Parking, Break Rooms, Roof Condition, Restrooms and Square Footage)
  - e. Building Systems (Network, Electrical, Heating, Air Conditioning and Emergency Power)
  - f. Client Service Impact (Parking, Waiting Area(s), Private Meeting Rooms and Restrooms).
- 3) Using the Facility Rating Worksheet Legend, place the corresponding number in the space provided that best describes the current condition as it relates to your facility.
- 4) Enter the information from on the Facility Rating Worksheet.
- 5) Carefully review all information and email the completed document to [donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov).
- 6) If you would like to provide additional information, please attach a word document containing information you think would be helpful. This information will not be used in the rating process, but may be included in the report as additional information.

## Attachment B

### Facility Rating Legend

Please use the following information in rating your facility. There are separate scales depending on the information requested or area being rated.

- 1) Agency Classification – This is the one digit number used by Human Resources to categorize local departments by staff size and is between one and six.
- 2) FIPS Code – self explanatory
- 3) ADA Compliance
  - 1 = Fully Compliant
  - 2 = Partially Compliant
  - 3 = Non-compliant
- 4) Public Transportation
  - 1 = Available within two blocks
  - 2 = Available within four blocks
  - 3 = Available within six blocks
  - 4 = Available within eight blocks
  - 5 = Not available
- 5) Life Safety
  - a. Security System
    - 1 = Electronic Surveillance System with Security Guards
    - 2 = Security Guards Present
    - 3 = Electronic Surveillance System
    - 4 = Electronic Card Controlled Access
    - 5 = None
  - b. Fire Alarm
    - 1 = Facility Fully Alarmed
    - 2 = Facility Partially Alarmed
    - 3 = No Fire Alarm
  - c. Sprinkler System
    - 1 = Facility Contains a System that covers the entire facility
    - 2 = Facility Contains a System that covers part of the facility
    - 3 = None

- d. Building Egress
    - 1 = Adequate Space for Employee Evacuation (40 inch wide passageways)
    - 2 = Inadequate Space for Employee Evacuation (less than 40 inch wide passageways)
  - e. Asbestos
    - 1 = Newer Facility non-issue
    - 2 = Asbestos Abatement Completed
    - 3 = Asbestos Status Unknown
- 6) Current Space Condition
- a. General Facility Condition
    - 1 = Excellent
    - 2 = Good
    - 3 = Fair
    - 4 = Poor
    - 5 = Deplorable
  - b. Furnishings
    - 1 = Excellent
    - 2 = Good
    - 3 = Fair
    - 4 = Poor
    - 5 = Deplorable
  - c. Lighting
    - 1 = Excellent
    - 2 = Good
    - 3 = Fair
    - 4 = Poor
    - 5 = Deplorable
  - d. Conference Rooms
    - 1 = Adequate
    - 2 = Inadequate
    - 3 = None
  - e. Employee Parking
    - 1 = Adjacent to the Facility
    - 2 = Within One City Block
    - 3 = Within Two City Blocks
    - 4 = More Than Two City Blocks Away
    - 5 = None Available

- f. Break Rooms
  - 1 = Adequate
  - 2 = Inadequate
  - 3 = None
  
- g. Roof Condition
  - 1 = Excellent
  - 2 = Good
  - 3 = Fair
  - 4 = Poor
  - 5 = Deplorable
  
- h. Restrooms
  - 1 = Adequate
  - 2 = Inadequate
  - 3 = None
  
- i. Square Footage per Employee – Central Office will assign rating based on your input. The following scale will be used for scoring this element.
  - 1 = 250 or more per person
  - 2 = 200 to 249 per person
  - 3 = 150 to 199 per person
  - 4 = Less than 150 per person

## 7) Building Systems

- a. Network
  - 1 = Fully Reliable – always available
  - 2 = Reliable – almost always available
  - 3 = Somewhat Reliable – down occasionally
  - 4 = Problematic – is down often
  - 5 = Dial up access only
  
- b. Electrical
  - 1 = Not an Issue
  - 2 = Power Consistently Available and adequate outlets
  - 3 = Power Consistently Available but inadequate outlets
  - 4 = Goes Down Often From Overloaded Circuits
  - 5 = Frequent Power Outages (not weather related)
  
- c. Heating
  - 1 = Temperature Maintained at Comfortable Levels
  - 2 = Temperature Normally Maintained at Comfortable Levels
  - 3 = Maintaining Comfortable Temperatures is Difficult
  - 4 = Maintaining Comfortable Temperatures is Almost Impossible

- d. Air Conditioning
    - 1 = Temperature Maintained at Comfortable Levels
    - 2 = Temperature Normally Maintained at Comfortable Levels
    - 3 = Maintaining Comfortable Temperatures is Difficult
    - 4 = Maintaining Comfortable Temperatures is Almost Impossible
  
  - e. Emergency Power
    - 1 = Available
    - 2 = Not Available
- 8) Client Service Impacts
- a. Customer Parking
    - 1 = Adjacent to the Facility
    - 2 = Within One City Block
    - 3 = Within Two City Blocks
    - 4 = More Than Two City Blocks Away
    - 5 = None Available
  
  - b. Customer Waiting Areas
    - 1 = Adequate
    - 2 = Inadequate
    - 3 = None
  
  - c. Private Meeting Rooms
    - 1 = Adequate
    - 2 = Inadequate
    - 3 = None
  
  - d. Customer Restrooms
    - 1 = Adequate
    - 2 = Inadequate
    - 3 = None

## FACILITY RATING WORK SHEET

For Rows 4 and 5 indicate the applicable number in column B. For the remaining row, indicate the numeric score based on the Facility Rating Legend - Attachment B of the cover memo.

	Facility #1	Facility #2	Facility #3	Facility #4	Facility #5	Facility #6
<b>1. Agency Classification #</b>						
<b>2. FIPS Code</b>						
<b>3. ADA Compliant</b>						
<b>4. Public Transportation</b>						
<b>5. Life Safety</b>						
(a) Security System						
(b) Fire Alarm						
(c) Sprinkler System						
(d) Building Egress						
(e) Asbestos						
<b>6. Current Space Condition</b>						
(a) General Facility Condition						
(b) Furnishings						
(c) Lighting						
(d) Conference Rooms						
(e) Employee Parking						
(f) Break Rooms						
(g) Roof Condition						
(h) Restrooms						
(i) Square Footage per Employee						
Facility Square Footage						
# Employees						
<b>7. Building Systems</b>						
(a) Network						
(b) Electrical						
(c) Heating						
(d) Air Conditioning						
(e) Emergency Power						
<b>8. Client Service Impacts</b>						
(a) Customer Parking						
(b) Customer Waiting Areas						
(c) Private Meeting Rooms						
(d) Customer Restrooms						

## Local Demographic Worksheet

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>FY2007/FY2008</b>	
<b>Completed By:</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Phone Number and E-Mail:</b>		Facility #1
<b><u>Field Names</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Field</u></b>	<b><u>List Required Information</u></b> (repeat this column for each Facility)
<b>Agency Classification</b>	Enter the Classification Code assigned to the locality	
<b>Locality</b>	Locality Name	
<b>FIPS Code</b>	Enter the FIPS Code assigned to the locality	
<b>Current Annual Facilities Cost (Rent/Utilities/Maintenance)</b>	Annual facility cost expense	
<b>Estimated Facilities Cost Increase (As is - without improvement or relocation)</b>	Annual Facility Cost Increase Estimate (If Applicable)	
<b>Estimated Facilities Cost Increase (Current facility with improvements)</b>	Annual Facility Cost Increase Estimate	
<b>Estimated Facilities Cost Increase (If a replacement facility is obtained)</b>	Annual Facility Cost Increase Estimate	
<b>Ownership</b>	Owner of the building (Local Gov't., Private, Corporate-managed by real estate firm, sublease-through Local Gov't., other)	



<b>Parking Provided at no cost to staff?</b>	<b>Yes or No.</b>	
<b>Has your locality consolidated or integrated facilities with another Human Services Organization?</b>	<b>Yes or No. If yes, when and with which agency(s)?</b>	
<b>Is your locality planning to consolidate or integrate facilities with another Human Services Organization?</b>	<b>Yes or No. If yes, when and with which agency(s)?</b>	
<b>If a new facility is planned, has land been bought for the facility?</b>	<b>Yes or No.</b>	
<b>Local Support</b>	<b>Would Local Gov't resources be made available if State funding is provided? Yes or No. If yes, when?</b>	

**APPENDIX C**  
**LDSS OFFICE SPACE**  
**INITIAL REPORT DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

**VDSS Staff:**

J.R. Simpson  
Chief Financial Officer  
Virginia Department of Social Services  
7 N. 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-726-7204  
[J.R.Simpson@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:J.R.Simpson@dss.virginia.gov)

Don Rainey  
Director General Services  
Virginia Department of Social Services  
7 N. 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-726-7177  
[donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:donald.rainey@dss.virginia.gov)

David Stankavich  
Financial Manager  
Virginia Department of Social Services  
7 N. 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-726-7344  
[david.stankavich@dss.virginia.gov](mailto:david.stankavich@dss.virginia.gov)

**Virginia League of Social Services**  
**Administrative Committee**  
**Representatives:**

Don Driver  
Director  
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County  
Department of Social Services  
110 N. Mason Street  
P.O. Box 809  
Harrisonburg, VA 22803  
540-574-5121  
[ddd165@northern.dss.state.va.us](mailto:ddd165@northern.dss.state.va.us)

Jordan (Rusty) W. Reynold  
Director  
Portsmouth Department of Social Services  
1701 High Street, Suite 101  
Portsmouth, VA 23704  
757-405-1869  
[rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us](mailto:rwj740@eastern.dss.state.va.us)

**APPENDIX D  
LDSS OFFICE SPACE  
PRIORITIZED LIST BY LOCAL SPACE  
NEEDS**

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
New Kent Department of Social Services	127	2	\$ 32,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,000	Corporate	U	5574	1
Amelia Department of Social Services	007	2	\$ 10,800	\$ 540	NA	\$ 90,442	Private	Y	5266	2*
Craig County Department of Social Services #1	045	3	\$ 7,850	\$ 2,100	\$ 3,825	\$ 5,500	Local Gov't	Y	4895	3
Pulaski County Department of Social Services	155	3	\$ -	NA	NA	\$ 200,000	IDA	Y	4824	4
Hopewell Department of Social Services #1	670	3	\$ 42,179	\$ 2,109	NA	\$ 98,785	Local Gov't	Y	4766	5
Charlottesville Department of Social Services #2	540	4	\$ 37,467	\$ 1,873	NA	\$ 20,658	Private	Y	4745	6
Cumberland County Department of Social Services #1	049	2	\$ 28,456	\$ 8,000	\$ 44,000	\$ 53,000	Private	Y	4563	7
Cumberland County Department of Social Services #2	049	2	\$ 6,100	\$ 2,000	NA	NA	Local Gov't	Y	4540	8
Lunenburg County Department of Social Services	111	2	\$ 28,209	\$ 4,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 17,000	Local Gov't	U	4496	9
Winchester Department of Social Services	840	3	\$ 121,850	\$ 15,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 95,000	Local Gov't	Y	4487	10
Craig County Department of Social Services #2	045	3	\$ 12,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,950	\$ 6,000	Local Gov't	Y	4463	11
Dinwiddie Department of Social Services	053	3	\$ 43,083	\$ 43,083	NA	\$ 140,000	Local Gov't	Y	4457	12
Greene County Department of Social Services	079	2	\$ 40,000	NA	\$ 18,000	\$ 39,000	Local Gov't	Y	4451	13
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #1	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	4342	14
Bristol City Department of Social Services	520	3	\$ 61,328	NA	\$ 20,000	\$ 199,329	Local Gov't	Y	4325	15
Richmond County Department of Social Services	159	2	\$ 31,000	\$ 1,550	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	4324	16
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #2	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	U	4289	17
Augusta-Stauton (Waynesboro separate) (Referred to as Shenandoah Valley) Department of Social Services	015 & 790	4	\$ 141,000	\$ 4,230	\$ -	\$ 104,000	Local Gov't	Y	4260	18
Warren County Department of Social Services	187	3	\$ 95,865	\$ 9,586	\$ -	\$ 140,713	Local Gov't	Y	4257	19
Westmoreland Department of Social Services	193	3	\$ 76,457	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	4256	20
Prince George Department of Social Services	149	2	\$ 43,213	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	Local Gov't	Y	4247	21
Franklin County Department of Social Services #1	067	3	\$ 56,000	\$ 2,240	\$ 5,600	\$ -	Private Community Action Agency	Y	4238	22
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #3	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private Community Action Agency	U	4232	23
Wythe County Department of Social Services	197	3	\$ 15,000	\$ 500	\$ 75,000	\$ 120,000	Local Gov't	Y	4229	24
King George Department of Social Services	099	2	\$ 72,792	\$ 3,640	NA	\$ 15,000	Private	Y	4225	25

\*Amelia County's input was based on a previous facility. The office was upgraded approximately three years ago.

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
Alleghany-Covington Department of Social Services	005 & 580	3	\$ 94,784	\$ 4,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 18,000	Local Gov't	Y	4146	26
Buckingham County Department of Social Services	029	3	\$ 44,650	\$ -	\$ 64,900	\$ 64,000	Local Gov't	Y	4119	27
Charles City Department of Social Services	036	2	\$ 15,801	\$ -	\$ 9,400	\$ 32,500	Local Gov't	Y	4115	28
Henry-Martinsville Department of Social Services	089 & 690	4	\$ 102,730	\$ 10,273	\$ -	\$ 384,659	Local Gov't	U	4104	29
Floyd County Department of Social Services	063	2	\$ 8,950	\$ 9,387	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	Local Gov't	U	4068	30
<b>SUB TOTALS</b>			\$ 1,269,604	\$ 125,611	\$ 388,675	\$ 1,957,586				
Franklin County Department of Social Services #2	067	3	\$ 21,862	\$ 874	\$ 2,186	\$ -	Private	Y	4049	31
Powhatan County Department of Social Services	145	2	\$ 24,603	\$ 1,302	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	4026	32
Suffolk Department of Social Services	800	4	\$ 185,210	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 519,640	Private	Y	3970	33
Isle of Wight Department of Social Services	093	3	\$ 19,237	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3935	34
Fredericksburg Department of Social Services	630	3	\$ 130,000	\$ -	\$ 60,587	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3912	35
Highland County Department of Social Services	091	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	U	3910	36
Halifax County Department of Social Services	083	3	\$ 140,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 280,000	Local Gov't	Y	3821	37
Nottoway County Department of Social Services	135	2	\$ 47,905	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3820	38
Charlotte County Department of Social Services	037	3	\$ 119,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3782	39
Manassas Park Department of Social Services	685	2	\$ 2,395	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3760	40
Hampton Department of Social Services	650	5	\$ 343,872	\$ 81,750	\$ -	\$ 573,498	HRHA	Y	3750	41
Stafford County Department of Social Services #2	179	3	\$ 53,817	\$ 10,550	\$ 16,100	\$ -	Corporate	NA	3725	42
Fluvanna County Department of Social Services	065	2	\$ 37,230	\$ 6,443	\$ 25,317	\$ 25,317	Local Gov't	U	3714	43
Newport News Department of Social Services #2	700	6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3703	44
Chesterfield/Colonial Heights Department of Social Services	041	5	\$ 231,000	\$ 23,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3648	45
Manassas City Department of Family Services	683	3	\$ 153,348	\$ 153,348	\$ -	\$ 158,254	Corporate	Y	3645	46
Bedford Department of Social Services #3	019	3	\$ 60,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	3640	47
Norton City Department of Social Services	720	2	\$ 30,460	\$ 1,540	\$ 9,540	\$ 19,540	Private	Y	3632	48
Louisa County Department of Social Services #2	109	3	\$ 18,440	\$ 738	\$ 3,688	\$ 3,688	Private	Y	3602	49
Henrico County Department of Social Services #2	087	5	\$ -	\$ -	NA	\$ 66,000	Local Gov't	Y	3537	50
Alexandria Division of Human Services #1 Mt Vernon	510	4	\$ 932,000	\$ 27,960	\$ 111,840	\$ 559,200	Corporate	Y	3536	51
Grayson County Department of Social Services	077	3	\$ 39,000	\$ -	\$ -	U	Local Gov't	N	3532	52
Henrico County Department of Social Services #1	087	5	\$ 183,643	\$ 4,000	NA	\$ 429,000	Local Gov't	Y	3528	53

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
Bedford Department of Social Services #2	019	3	\$ 41,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	3475	54
Bedford Department of Social Services #1	019	3	\$ 261,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	N	3454	55
Danville Division of Social Services	590	4	\$ 241,413	\$ 29,547	\$ 50,000	\$ 180,000	Local Gov't	Y	3453	56
Newport News Department of Social Services #1	700	6	\$ 1,232,447	\$ 80,000	\$ 114,449	\$ -	NNDA	Y	3448	57
Russell County Department of Social Services #1	167	3	\$ 93,309	\$ -	NA	\$ 28,000	Private	Y	3432	58
Washington County Department of Social Services	191	3	\$ 135,815	\$ 5,500	\$ 15,000	\$ -	IDA	NA	3422	59
Virginia Beach Division of Social Services	810	5	\$ 1,142,950	\$ 11,430	\$ -	\$ -	VB Dev Auth	Y	3420	60
Caroline Co Department of Social Services	033	3	\$ 66,300	\$ -	\$ 6,630	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3416	61
Surry Department of Social Services	181	1	\$ 48,072	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3349	62
Rockbridge-Buena Vista-Lexington Area Social Services	163	3	\$ 47,527	\$ 7,473	\$ 13,473	\$ -	Private	U	3310	63
Northumberland County Department of Social Services	133	2	\$ 60,410	\$ 906	\$ 10,000	\$ -	Private	Y	3307	64
Richmond City Department of Social Services #1	760	6	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 3,000,000	Private	Y	3301	65
Alexandria Division of Human Services #3 Herbert	510	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Corporate	Y	3282	66
Fauquier County Department of Social Services #2	061	3	\$ 62,000	\$ 101,492	\$ -	\$ -	Private	Y	3279	67
Roanoke County Department of Social Services	161	1	\$ 232,000	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	3270	68
Brunswick County Department of Social Services	025	3	\$ 59,410	\$ 2,971	\$ -	\$ -	Local IDA	U	3252	69
Sussex #2 Department of Social Services	183	3	\$ 35,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 60,000	Private	Y	3235	70
Lancaster County Department of Social Services	103	2	\$ 26,200	\$ -	\$ 32,000	\$ 38,000	Local Gov't	U	3232	71
Waynesboro (Augusta-Stauton separate) (referred to as Shenandoah Valley) Department of Social Services	820	4	\$ 109,000	\$ 3,270	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3210	72
Galax City Department of Social Services	640	2	\$ 12,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3207	73
Madison County Department of Social Services	113	2	\$ 40,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3179	74
Campbell County Department of Social Services	031	3	\$ 54,275	\$ -	\$ 5,725	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3145	75
Goochland Department of Social Services	075	2	\$ 35,640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3139	76
Russell County Department of Social Services #2	167	3	\$ 30,173	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 28,000	Private	Y	3116	77
Charlottesville Department of Social Services #1	540	4	\$ 265,191	\$ 13,260	\$ 104,177	\$ 348,911	Local Gov't	Y	3105	78
Bath County Department of Social Services	017	1	\$ 27,246	\$ 1,362	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3093	79
Wise County Department of Social Services	195	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3031	80
Middlesex County Department of Social Services	119	2	\$ 10,000	\$ 300	\$ 10,300	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	3030	81
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #2	165	4	\$ 36,648	NA	NA	NA	Private	U	3027	82
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #3	165	4	NA	NA	NA	\$ 52,506	Private	Y	3027	82
Smyth County Department of Social Services	173	3	\$ 78,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3005	84

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
Amherst Department of Social Services	009	3	\$ 15,146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3001	85
King and Queen Department of Social Services	097	2	\$ 72,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2989	86
Fauquier County Department of Social Services #1	061	3	\$ 154,000	\$ 9,492	\$ -	\$ 116,000	Local Gov't	Y	2965	87
Louisa County Department of Social Services #1	109	3	\$ 66,564	\$ 2,663	\$ 13,313	\$ 13,313	Local Gov't	Y	2964	88
Stafford County Department of Social Services #1	179	3	\$ 22,230	\$ 667	\$ 5,725	\$ 237,000	Local Gov't	Y	2962	89
York/Poquoson Social Services	199	3	\$ 149,544	\$ 7,477	\$ 7,477	\$ 37,386	Local Gov't	Y	2920	90
King William Department of Social Services	101	2	\$ 41,328	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2916	91
Mathews Department of Social Services	115	2	\$ 13,164	N	N	N	Local Gov't	Y	2904	92
Hanover County Department of Social Services #3	085	3	\$ 2,400	\$ 120	\$ 120	\$ 120	Other	Y	2856	93
Hanover County Department of Social Services #1	085	3	\$ 67,300	\$ 3,365	\$ 3,365	\$ 3,365	Local Gov't	Y	2852	94
Sussex #1 Department of Social Services	183	3	\$ 85,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 110,000	Local Gov't	Y	2818	95
Hanover County Department of Social Services #2	085	3	\$ 21,400	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,070	Corporate	Y	2757	96
Norfolk Department of Human Services #2	710	6	\$ 789,146	\$ 1,210	\$ -	\$ -	Lease	Y	2754	97
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #1	165	4	\$ 213,006	NA	NA	\$ 1,320,000	RDHA	U	2702	98
Spotsylvania Department of Social Services	177	3	\$ 351,074	\$ -	NA	\$ -	0	Y	2698	99
Russell County Department of Social Services #3	167	3	\$ 16,845	NA	NA	NA	Private	Y	2698	100
Scott County Department of Social Services	169	3	\$ 114,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Econ Dev	U	2667	101
Shenandoah County Department of Social Services	171	3	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000	Local Gov't	Y	2659	102
Hopewell Department of Social Services #2	670	3	\$ 26,934	\$ 28,281	NA	NA	Private	NA	2585	103
Buchanan County Department of Social Services	027	3	\$ 270,272	\$ 9,728	\$ 40,728	\$ 79,728	IDA	NA	2532	104
Lee County Department of Social Services	105	3	\$ 42,566	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,964	Local Gov't	U	2520	105
Hanover County Department of Social Services #4	085	3	\$ 1,000	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	Local Gov't	Y	2507	106
Richmond City Department of Social Services #2	760	6	\$ 740,400	\$ 22,212	\$ 50,000	\$ -	Corporate	Y	2501	107
Alexandria Division of Human Services #2 Job Link	510	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2488	108
Arlington County Department of Social Services #3 Edison	013	4	\$ 125,560	\$ 6,278	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2444	109
Southampton County Department of Social Services	175	3	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2421	110
Arlington County Department of Social Services #4 Clarendon	013	4	\$ 30,960	\$ 1,548	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2331	111
Giles County Department of Social Services	071	3	\$ 39,667	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	IDA	U	2323	112
Prince Edward County Department of Social Services	147	3	\$ 68,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2317	113
Arlington County Department of Social Services #6 Madison	013	4	\$ 25,112	\$ 1,256	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2314	114
Gloucester Department of Social Services	073	3	\$ 163,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	N	2312	115
Frederick County Department of Social Services	069	3	\$ 210,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	2312	116

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
Portsmouth Department of Social Services	740	5	\$ 1,858,827	\$ 72,796	\$ 225,000	\$ 2,000,000	Local Gov't	NA	2291	117
Norfolk Department of Human Services #1	710	6	\$ 1,367,205	\$ 7,542	\$ -	\$ -	Lease	Y	2291	118
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #2 UVA HOSP	003	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Hospital	Y	2268	119
Arlington County Department of Social Services #1 Wilson	013	4	\$ 1,003,000	\$ 50,150	\$ -	\$ -	Private	NA	2162	120
Carroll County Department of Social Services	035	3	\$ 30,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2147	121
James City County Department of Social Services #1	095	3	\$ 95,593	\$ 5,000	\$ 138,750	NA	Local Gov't	Y	2131	122
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #3 Schools	003	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Schools	Y	2130	123
Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services	117	3	\$ 50,850	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	2123	124
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #1 COB5	003	3	\$ 460,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2082	125
Accomack Department of Social Services	001	3	\$ 386,700	\$ 6,747	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2079	126
Arlington County Department of Social Services #2 Drewry	013	4	\$ 242,286	\$ 12,114	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2061	127
James City County Department of Social Services #2	095	3	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	Private	Y	1974	128
Arlington County Department of Social Services #5 Fenwick	013	4	\$ 141,040	\$ 7,052	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	1808	129
<b>SUB TOTALS</b>			\$ 19,381,770	\$ 944,833	\$ 2,458,610	\$ 10,491,550				
Appomattox Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Bland County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Botetourt County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Chesapeake Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Clarke County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Culpeper County Human Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Dickenson County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Essex Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Fairfax County Department of Family Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Franklin City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Greensville/Emporia Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Loudoun County Department of Family Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Lynchburg Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Montgomery County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Priority Ranking
Nelson County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Northampton County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Orange County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Page County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Patrick County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Petersburg Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Pittsylvania County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Prince William County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Radford City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Rappahannock County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Roanoke City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
Williamsburg Social Service Bureau	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0	0
<b>Grand Totals</b>			\$ 20,651,374	\$ 1,070,444	\$ 2,847,285	\$ 12,449,136				



**APPENDIX E**  
**LDSS OFFICE SPACE**  
**PRIORITIZED LIST BY AGENCY**  
**CLASSIFICATION**

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Highland County Department of Social Services	091	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	U	3910	36	1
Surry Department of Social Services	181	1	\$ 48,072	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3349	62	2
Roanoke County Department of Social Services	161	1	\$ 232,000	\$ 19,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	3270	68	3
Bath County Department of Social Services	017	1	\$ 27,246	\$ 1,362	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3093	79	4
<b>Sub Totals</b>			<b>\$ 307,318</b>	<b>\$ 20,362</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>					
New Kent Department of Social Services	127	2	\$ 32,040	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,000	Corporate	U	5574	1	1
Amelia Department of Social Services	007	2	\$ 10,800	\$ 540	NA	\$ 90,442	Private	Y	5266	2	2*
Cumberland County Department of Social Services #1	049	2	\$ 28,456	\$ 8,000	\$ 44,000	\$ 53,000	Private	Y	4563	7	3
Cumberland County Department of Social Services #2	049	2	\$ 6,100	\$ 2,000	NA	NA	Local Gov't	Y	4540	8	4
Lunenburg County Department of Social Services	111	2	\$ 28,209	\$ 4,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 17,000	Local Gov't	U	4496	9	5
Greene County Department of Social Services	079	2	\$ 40,000	NA	\$ 18,000	\$ 39,000	Local Gov't	Y	4451	13	6
Richmond County Department of Social Services	159	2	\$ 31,000	\$ 1,550	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	4324	16	7
Prince George Department of Social Services	149	2	\$ 43,213	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	Local Gov't	Y	4247	21	8
King George Department of Social Services	099	2	\$ 72,792	\$ 3,640	NA	\$ 15,000	Private	Y	4225	25	9
Charles City Department of Social Services	036	2	\$ 15,801	\$ -	\$ 9,400	\$ 32,500	Local Gov't	Y	4115	28	10
Floyd County Department of Social Services	063	2	\$ 8,950	\$ 9,387	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	Local Gov't	U	4068	30	11
Powhatan County Department of Social Services	145	2	\$ 24,603	\$ 1,302	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	4026	32	12
Nottoway County Department of Social Services	135	2	\$ 47,905	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3820	38	13
Manassas Park Department of Social Services	685	2	\$ 2,395	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3760	40	14
Fluvanna County Department of Social Services	065	2	\$ 37,230	\$ 6,443	\$ 25,317	\$ 25,317	Local Gov't	U	3714	43	15
Norton City Department of Social Services	720	2	\$ 30,460	\$ 1,540	\$ 9,540	\$ 19,540	Private	Y	3632	48	16
Northumberland County Department of Social Services	133	2	\$ 60,410	\$ 906	\$ 10,000	\$ -	Private	Y	3307	64	17
Lancaster County Department of Social Services	103	2	\$ 26,200	\$ -	\$ 32,000	\$ 38,000	Local Gov't	U	3232	71	18
Galax City Department of Social Services	640	2	\$ 12,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3207	73	19
Madison County Department of Social Services	113	2	\$ 40,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3179	74	20

\*Amelia County's input was based on a previous facility. The office was upgraded approximately three years ago.

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Goochland Department of Social Services	075	2	\$ 35,640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3139	76	21
Middlesex County Department of Social Services	119	2	\$ 10,000	\$ 300	\$ 10,300	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	3030	81	22
King and Queen Department of Social Services	097	2	\$ 72,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2989	86	23
King William Department of Social Services	101	2	\$ 41,328	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2916	91	24
Mathews Department of Social Services	115	2	\$ 13,164	N	N	N	Local Gov't	Y	2904	92	25
<b>Sub Totals</b>			<b>\$ 771,685</b>	<b>\$ 39,608</b>	<b>\$ 233,557</b>	<b>\$ 443,799</b>					
Craig County Department of Social Services #1	045	3	\$ 7,850	\$ 2,100	\$ 3,825	\$ 5,500	Local Gov't	Y	4895	3	1
Pulaski County Department of Social Services	155	3	\$ -	NA	NA	\$ 200,000	IDA	Y	4824	4	2
Hopewell Department of Social Services #1	670	3	\$ 42,179	\$ 2,109	NA	\$ 98,785	Local Gov't	Y	4766	5	3
Winchester Department of Social Services	840	3	\$ 121,850	\$ 15,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 95,000	Local Gov't	Y	4487	10	4
Craig County Department of Social Services #2	045	3	\$ 12,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,950	\$ 6,000	Local Gov't	Y	4463	11	5
Dinwiddie Department of Social Services	053	3	\$ 43,083	\$ 43,083	NA	\$ 140,000	Local Gov't	Y	4457	12	6
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #1	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	4342	14	7
Bristol City Department of Social Services	520	3	\$ 61,328	NA	\$ 20,000	\$ 199,329	Local Gov't	Y	4325	15	8
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #2	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	U	4289	17	9
Warren County Department of Social Services	187	3	\$ 95,865	\$ 9,586	\$ -	\$ 140,713	Local Gov't	Y	4257	19	10
Westmoreland Department of Social Services	193	3	\$ 76,457	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	4256	20	11
Franklin County Department of Social Services #1	067	3	\$ 56,000	\$ 2,240	\$ 5,600	\$ -	Private	Y	4238	22	12
Tazewell County Department of Social Services #3	185	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Community Action Agency	U	4232	23	13
Wythe County Department of Social Services	197	3	\$ 15,000	\$ 500	\$ 75,000	\$ 120,000	Local Gov't	Y	4229	24	14
Alleghany-Covington Department of Social Services	005 & 580	3	\$ 94,784	\$ 4,500	\$ 10,000	\$ 18,000	Local Gov't	Y	4146	26	15
Buckingham County Department of Social Services	029	3	\$ 44,650	\$ -	\$ 64,900	\$ 64,000	Local Gov't	Y	4119	27	16
Franklin County Department of Social Services #2	067	3	\$ 21,862	\$ 874	\$ 2,186	\$ -	Private	Y	4049	31	17
Isle of Wight Department of Social Services	093	3	\$ 19,237	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3935	34	18
Fredericksburg Department of Social Services	630	3	\$ 130,000	\$ -	\$ 60,587	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3912	35	19
Halifax County Department of Social Services	083	3	\$ 140,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 280,000	Local Gov't	Y	3821	37	20
Charlotte County Department of Social Services	037	3	\$ 119,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3782	39	21
Stafford County Department of Social Services #2	179	3	\$ 53,817	\$ 10,550	\$ 16,100	\$ -	Corporate	NA	3725	42	22
Manassas City Department of Family Services	683	3	\$ 153,348	\$ 153,348	\$ -	\$ 158,254	Corporate	Y	3645	46	23
Bedford Department of Social Services #3	019	3	\$ 60,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	3640	47	24
Louisa County Department of Social Services #2	109	3	\$ 18,440	\$ 738	\$ 3,688	\$ 3,688	Private	Y	3602	49	25

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Grayson County Department of Social Services	077	3	\$ 39,000	\$ -	\$ -	U	Local Gov't	N	3532	52	26
Bedford Department of Social Services #2	019	3	\$ 41,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Private	N	3475	54	27
Bedford Department of Social Services #1	019	3	\$ 261,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	N	3454	55	28
Russell County Department of Social Services #1	167	3	\$ 93,309	\$ -	NA	\$ 28,000	Private	Y	3432	58	29
Washington County Department of Social Services	191	3	\$ 135,815	\$ 5,500	\$ 15,000	\$ -	IDA	NA	3422	59	30
Caroline Co Department of Social Services	033	3	\$ 66,300	\$ -	\$ 6,630	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3416	61	31
Rockbridge-Buena Vista-Lexington Area Social Services	163	3	\$ 47,527	\$ 7,473	\$ 13,473	\$ -	Private	U	3310	63	32
Fauquier County Department of Social Services #2	061	3	\$ 62,000	\$ 101,492	\$ -	\$ -	Private	Y	3279	67	33
Brunswick County Department of Social Services	025	3	\$ 59,410	\$ 2,971	\$ -	\$ -	Local IDA	U	3252	69	34
Sussex #2 Department of Social Services	183	3	\$ 35,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 60,000	Private	Y	3235	70	35
Campbell County Department of Social Services	031	3	\$ 54,275	\$ -	\$ 5,725	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3145	75	36
Russell County Department of Social Services #2	167	3	\$ 30,173	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 28,000	Private	Y	3116	77	37
Smyth County Department of Social Services	173	3	\$ 78,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3005	84	38
Amherst Department of Social Services	009	3	\$ 15,146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	3001	85	39
Fauquier County Department of Social Services #1	061	3	\$ 154,000	\$ 9,492	\$ -	\$ 116,000	Local Gov't	Y	2965	87	40
Louisa County Department of Social Services #1	109	3	\$ 66,564	\$ 2,663	\$ 13,313	\$ 13,313	Local Gov't	Y	2964	88	41
Stafford County Department of Social Services #1	179	3	\$ 22,230	\$ 667	\$ 5,725	\$ 237,000	Local Gov't	Y	2962	89	42
York/Poquoson Social Services	199	3	\$ 149,544	\$ 7,477	\$ 7,477	\$ 37,386	Local Gov't	Y	2920	90	43
Hanover County Department of Social Services #3	085	3	\$ 2,400	\$ 120	\$ 120	\$ 120	Other	Y	2856	93	44
Hanover County Department of Social Services #1	085	3	\$ 67,300	\$ 3,365	\$ 3,365	\$ 3,365	Local Gov't	Y	2852	94	45
Sussex #1 Department of Social Services	183	3	\$ 85,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 110,000	Local Gov't	Y	2818	95	46
Hanover County Department of Social Services #2	085	3	\$ 21,400	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,070	\$ 1,070	Corporate	Y	2757	96	47
Spotsylvania Department of Social Services	177	3	\$ 351,074	\$ -	NA	\$ -	0	Y	2698	99	48
Russell County Department of Social Services #3	167	3	\$ 16,845	NA	NA	NA	Private	Y	2698	100	49
Scott County Department of Social Services	169	3	\$ 114,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Econ Dev	U	2667	101	50
Shenandoah County Department of Social Services	171	3	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000	Local Gov't	Y	2659	102	51
Hopewell Department of Social Services #2	670	3	\$ 26,934	\$ 28,281	NA	NA	Private	NA	2585	103	52
Buchanan County Department of Social Services	027	3	\$ 270,272	\$ 9,728	\$ 40,728	\$ 79,728	IDA	NA	2532	104	53
Lee County Department of Social Services	105	3	\$ 42,566	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,964	Local Gov't	U	2520	105	54
Hanover County Department of Social Services #4	085	3	\$ 1,000	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 50	Local Gov't	Y	2507	106	55

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Southampton County Department of Social Services	175	3	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2421	110	56
Giles County Department of Social Services	071	3	\$ 39,667	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	IDA	U	2323	112	57
Prince Edward County Department of Social Services	147	3	\$ 68,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2317	113	58
Gloucester Department of Social Services	073	3	\$ 163,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	N	2312	115	59
Frederick County Department of Social Services	069	3	\$ 210,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	2312	116	60
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #2 UVA HOSP	003	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Hospital	Y	2268	119	61
Carroll County Department of Social Services	035	3	\$ 30,420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2147	121	62
James City County Department of Social Services #1	095	3	\$ 95,593	\$ 5,000	\$ 138,750	NA	Local Gov't	Y	2131	122	63
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #3 Schools	003	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Schools	Y	2130	123	64
Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services	117	3	\$ 50,850	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	U	2123	124	65
Albemarle County Department of Social Services #1 COBS	003	3	\$ 460,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2082	125	66
Accomack Department of Social Services	001	3	\$ 386,700	\$ 6,747	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2079	126	67
James City County Department of Social Services #2	095	3	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	Private	Y	1974	128	68
<b>Sub Totals</b>			\$ 5,451,258	\$ 465,723	\$ 758,262	\$ 2,447,265					
Charlottesville Department of Social Services #2	540	4	\$ 37,467	\$ 1,873	NA	\$ 20,658	Private	Y	4745	6	1
Augusta-Stauton (Waynesboro separate) (Referred to as Shenandoah Valley) Department of Social Services	015 & 790	4	\$ 141,000	\$ 4,230	\$ -	\$ 104,000	Local Gov't	Y	4260	18	2
Henry-Martinsville Department of Social Services	089 & 690	4	\$ 102,730	\$ 10,273	\$ -	\$ 384,659	Local Gov't	U	4104	29	3
Suffolk Department of Social Services	800	4	\$ 185,210	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 519,640	Private	Y	3970	33	4
Alexandria Division of Human Services #1 Mt Vernon	510	4	\$ 932,000	\$ 27,960	\$ 111,840	\$ 559,200	Corporate	Y	3536	51	5
Danville Division of Social Services	590	4	\$ 241,413	\$ 29,547	\$ 50,000	\$ 180,000	Local Gov't	Y	3453	56	6
Alexandria Division of Human Services #3 Herbert	510	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Corporate	Y	3282	66	7
Waynesboro (Augusta-Stauton separate) (referred to as Shenandoah Valley) Department of Social Services	820	4	\$ 109,000	\$ 3,270	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3210	72	8
Charlottesville Department of Social Services #1	540	4	\$ 265,191	\$ 13,260	\$ 104,177	\$ 348,911	Local Gov't	Y	3105	78	9
Wise County Department of Social Services	195	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3031	80	10
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #2	165	4	\$ 36,648	NA	NA	NA	Private	U	3027	82	11
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #3	165	4	NA	NA	NA	\$ 52,506	Private	Y	3027	82	12

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Department of Social Services #1	165	4	\$ 213,006	NA	NA	\$ 1,320,000	RDHA	U	2702	98	13
Alexandria Division of Human Services #2 Job Link	510	4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	2488	108	14
Arlington County Department of Social Services #3 Edison	013	4	\$ 125,560	\$ 6,278	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2444	109	15
Arlington County Department of Social Services #4 Clarendon	013	4	\$ 30,960	\$ 1,548	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2331	111	16
Arlington County Department of Social Services #6 Madison	013	4	\$ 25,112	\$ 1,256	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2314	114	17
Arlington County Department of Social Services #1 Wilson	013	4	\$ 1,003,000	\$ 50,150	\$ -	\$ -	Private	NA	2162	120	18
Arlington County Department of Social Services #2 Drewry	013	4	\$ 242,286	\$ 12,114	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	2061	127	19
Arlington County Department of Social Services #5 Fenwick	013	4	\$ 141,040	\$ 7,052	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	NA	1808	129	20
<b>Sub Totals</b>			<b>\$ 3,831,623</b>	<b>\$ 168,811</b>	<b>\$ 266,017</b>	<b>\$ 3,489,574</b>					
<b>Hampton Department of Social Services</b>											
Hampton Department of Social Services	650	5	\$ 343,872	\$ 81,750	\$ -	\$ 573,498	HRHA	Y	3750	41	1
Chesterfield/Colonial Heights Department of Social Services	041	5	\$ 231,000	\$ 23,000	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3648	45	2
Henrico County Department of Social Services #2	087	5	\$ -	\$ -	NA	\$ 66,000	Local Gov't	Y	3537	50	3
Henrico County Department of Social Services #1	087	5	\$ 183,643	\$ 4,000	NA	\$ 429,000	Local Gov't	Y	3528	53	4
Virginia Beach Division of Social Services	810	5	\$ 1,142,950	\$ 11,430	\$ -	\$ -	VB Dev Auth	Y	3420	60	5
Portsmouth Department of Social Services	740	5	\$ 1,858,827	\$ 72,796	\$ 225,000	\$ 2,000,000	Local Gov't	NA	2291	117	6
<b>Sub Totals</b>			<b>\$ 3,760,292</b>	<b>\$ 192,976</b>	<b>\$ 225,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,068,498</b>					
<b>Newport News Department of Social Services #2</b>											
Newport News Department of Social Services #2	700	6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Local Gov't	Y	3703	44	1
Newport News Department of Social Services #1	700	6	\$ 1,232,447	\$ 80,000	\$ 114,449	\$ -	NNDA	Y	3448	57	2
Richmond City Department of Social Services #1	760	6	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 3,000,000	Private	Y	3301	65	3
Norfolk Department of Human Services #2	710	6	\$ 789,146	\$ 1,210	\$ -	\$ -	Lease	Y	2754	97	4
Richmond City Department of Social Services #2	760	6	\$ 740,400	\$ 22,212	\$ 50,000	\$ -	Corporate	Y	2501	107	5
Norfolk Department of Human Services #1	710	6	\$ 1,367,205	\$ 7,542	\$ -	\$ -	Lease	Y	2291	118	6
<b>Sub Totals</b>			<b>\$ 6,529,198</b>	<b>\$ 182,964</b>	<b>\$ 1,364,449</b>	<b>\$ 3,000,000</b>					

Local Facilities	Fips Code	Class Size	Current Annual Facility Cost	Est Facility Cost Increase (as is)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with improvements)	Est Facility Cost Increase (with replacement)	Ownership Y/N	Local Funding Match Support Y/N	Total Overall Value	Overall Priority Ranking	Priority Ranking by Class Size
Appomattox Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		1
Bland County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		2
Botetourt County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		3
Chesapeake Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		4
Clarke County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		5
Culpeper County Human Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		6
Dickenson County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		7
Essex Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		8
Fairfax County Department of Family Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		9
Franklin City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		10
Greenville/Emporia Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		11
Loudoun County Department of Family Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		12
Lynchburg Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		13
Montgomery County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		14
Nelson County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		15
Northampton County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		16
Orange County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		17
Page County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		18
Patrick County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		19
Petersburg Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		20
Pittsylvania County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		21
Prince William County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		22
Radford City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		23
Rappahannock County Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		24
Roanoke City Department of Social Services	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		25
Williamsburg Social Service Bureau	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	0		26
<b>Grand Totals</b>			\$ 20,651,374	\$ 1,070,444	\$ 2,847,285	\$ 12,449,136					

**APPENDIX F**  
**LDSS OFFICE SPACE**  
**SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST INFORMATION**

**Locality Name: Accomack County**

**FIPS Code: 001**

Our locality is one of those receiving General Fund dollars for office space through a Budget Amendment. We have received \$75,000 since FY 00-01. We occupied our new facility on March 21, 2005 and are absolutely thrilled to be here. Without the Budget Amendment we would be at the top of your priority list.

**Locality Name: Albemarle County**

**FIPS Code: 003**

You advised that we could provide additional information that would not be used in the analysis but may be useful in the final report. To that end I would like to provide the following information:

- After many years of trying to obtain state support for a building with no success Albemarle County funded the renovation of two buildings for our department within the past eight years in order to accommodate our growing need. While we have been able to obtain reimbursement for rent for both of these buildings using state and federal administrative funds to the extent they are available, it was the county that supplied the funds for renovations to both buildings. It is unfortunate that there was a decision to not include any recent efforts by local government in this survey since Albemarle had to provide significant un-reimbursed funding for their local DSS.
- We have multiple off-site locations that I wanted to address in this memo. The first is our off-site unit at UVA Hospital that is managed through a contract with UVA, VDSS and Albemarle County DSS. UVA supplies the “local match” for federal pass through funds to support this effort but not included in that is any reimbursement for office space. Currently UVA “absorbs” this cost, thus in the spreadsheet it is left blank. The same is true for potential renovations. I may be able to determine this but in order to get this information to you timely I was unable to do the full analysis. The second off-site location is in our schools. We have social work staff located in 14 of our 23 schools, whereby the schools provide the space in-kind. Some of the space is workable while other schools are very limited in what they can provide. I showed this space on the spreadsheet under one column but it is actually 14 different schools, each a little different from the other.

**Locality Name: Amelia County**

**FIPS Code: 007**

Please note that I have filled out the demographics and facility rating worksheet as if we were still located in our privately owned former quarters. Three years ago our county renovated an unused school building and relocated us here in our present facility due to the fact that the condition of our former quarters was (embarrassingly) poor. However, we have not received one additional cent in reimbursement from the State for our upgraded facility. I am glad that there may be some priority given to upgrading current facilities but what about increasing the

reimbursement for those localities that took it upon themselves to upgrade the conditions of their facilities and haven't received any additional State reimbursement? My Board, County Administrator, the Board of Supervisors and I would like to know when our efforts to bring our facility into compliance will be recognized with the proper reimbursement. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

**Locality Name: Amherst County**

**FIPS Code: 009**

The Amherst County Department of Social Services Board has made the Amherst County Board of Supervisors aware of the need for additional office space in the near future. The Amherst County Department of Social Services Board has contracted with an architect to evaluate our current office space and to make recommendations.

**Locality Name: Augusta/Staunton**

**FIPS Code: 015**

Shenandoah Valley DSS serves 3 FIPS from 2 sites. Our main building site in Verona is a former warehouse built in 1964 and converted to office space. The roof has major leaks and cannot support heavy snow accumulations. We consolidated administratively with Waynesboro DSS in 2003 and the plans are to build a new consolidated centralized site in the near future. The assistance of state funds would greatly help move this project along.

**Locality Name: Bath County**

**FIPS Code: 017**

Bath Co. DSS has only one facility and is housed within the County Courthouse. The offices are part of an addition built in 1981 to the existing courthouse. Federal and State participation was authorized for the cost of construction and amortization was calculated over 40 years (or until 2021).

Also included in that calculation and the current monthly payment to the locality is janitorial services, electric, heat etc. From 1981 to present this amount has not been reviewed for actual changes in these related costs. It would seem that this would not be appropriate until the end of the 40 year "contract" period. It would also seem that DSS is obligated to remain (or must be allowed to remain) in this facility until the end of the contract. This issue would have to be clarified in the event any move was planned. The anticipated increase of 5% is related to increasing telephone/computer line costs.

While there are some needs in this facility, they clearly are not a priority in light of conditions in many other agencies. Without some actual estimates from contractors, it would be impossible to accurately state what desired renovations, relocation or replacement would cost. A best guess is that the desired renovations would be at least \$130,000 and a replacement would be a minimum of two million. To renovate another site/relocate would likely be at least one million.

In our existing facility there is only one exit (safety issue), no conference room and no private bathrooms for staff only. An existing conference room has been converted essentially to an office for the CSA Coordinator. Ideally renovations are needed to address these issues. Actual office space is more than adequate for existing full time DSS staff (7). However, as many localities, we have "inherited" CSA and its related requirements one of which is a CSA Coordinator. Therefore, we are really housing 8 individuals.



As in many areas, there is a space/parking problem in this Courthouse overall. The Board of Supervisors is in the initial stages of looking at this issue and contemplating options. One of the first stages of this process was offering DSS the option of moving to another (yet undetermined) location. There was no clear plan offered about location, cost and related responsibility in this proposed move. However, DSS declined this option. It is unclear at this time how this issue will develop. Therefore, I cannot accurately answer your form questions about planning for a consolidation/integration of agencies, purchase of land, cost, or what local support may be available.

**Locality Name: Chesterfield-Colonial Heights**

**FIPS Code: 041**

The space needs data collection tool has been completed and submitted for our department.

We are aware that the intent of this data collection effort is to develop criteria for assessing local agency space needs which may result in additional funding.

Chesterfield has continuously identified the lack of office space as a critical issue for the past 12 years. We have addressed this concern both locally and at the Virginia Department of Social Services level.

Locally we have pursued and been approved for renovation and expansion to our current facility through the Capital Improvement Project. However, our local government expects Chesterfield-Colonial Heights DSS to fund some of the costs from our administrative budgets received through the Virginia Department of Social Services. At this point, these additional costs are unknown.

Our request is that some consideration be given to local departments, such as Chesterfield-Colonial Heights DSS that have taken steps on their own to resolve their critical space issues.

**Locality Name: Henry-Martinsville**

**FIPS Code: 089**

#3 ADA Compliant: Although we have 6 handicapped parking spaces, two of them are partially blocked by a dumpster. We have 4 employees who are themselves handicapped. That leaves only 2 spaces for customers. Our entrance ramp is too steep and is difficult for wheelchair users to maneuver. Our lobby entrance doors are hard to open and close and have no automatic button to open them. We had an Accessibility Study completed by Piedmont Independent Living Center. A copy of that study will be sent to you via the courier pouch.

#4 Public Transportation: The Senior Citizens' bus brings a few elderly customers to the agency. General public transportation is non-existent other than several taxi companies, but most customers cannot afford the fare.

#5 Life Safety:

- a. Security System: We have an electronic security system which engages during night hours. The first person to come into the building in the morning must enter a code to disarm the system. We have no security cameras. The inside doors to each floor have coded entrances to prevent customers or intruders from gaining entry into the main part

of the building where employees work. We have a fire and smoke alarm system that calls the local Fire Station if smoke or fire occurs.

- d. Egress: Although our hallways are wide enough for evacuation, we have many file cabinets, copiers, forms cabinets, etc. located in the halls. We have only 3 doors from which to exit in case of emergency.

#### #6 Current Space Conditions:

- a. General Facility Condition: Please refer to our October 2004 Facility Assessment and the pictures enclosed. Most of the issues we have here at Henry-Martinsville Social Services are addressed in that document. I want to specifically point out some to you here. Our building is almost 70 years old and still has much of the original plumbing, and wiring. Our water pipes and sewage lines are old and break or back up at times causing raw sewage to spill out and soak through the floors to areas below (at lobby entrance and in our employee break room). We recently had to have exterminator services for termites and fleas/mites (this was above our normal monthly exterminating service). Our average monthly repairs alone are in excess of \$1,000 (this is not counting our normal administrative expenses). In 2004, we requested that the Fire Marshall conduct an inspection of our building. Many of the hazards he found were directly as a result of our crowded conditions and lack of storage space. Others are not correctable as long as H-MDSS inhabits this facility. We've corrected what we could. Our employee entrance is beside the main lobby entrance. The only area for employees to smoke is on the loading dock which is in full view of all people coming and going through the parking lot or to the agency.
- b. Furnishings: Although we have a lot of old furniture, we have been trying to upgrade by purchasing some new desks, chairs, bookshelves, etc. each year.
- d. Conference rooms: Our Board Room is too small to adequately conduct meetings. With 9 board members, our agency attorney, director, 2 chiefs, office manager, secretary, newspaper reporter, and other guests, the room is packed. There is no room for presentation materials, computers, overhead projectors, easels, etc. The room is not ventilated causing it to be hot in the summer, cold in the winter, and oxygen depleted. Our one and only Conference Room holds only 20 to 25 people comfortably. We cannot have full staff meetings due to lack of space. We are forced to use this room also for storing old computers, printers, etc. until they are picked up by the State. At times, we have to use that area for family visitations (we have only 1 Family Visitation Room for foster children/parents supervised visits and other court ordered visitations). Our break room holds only 10 to 12 employees at a time. It opens out onto a large, double stairway to the second floor. Food odors and voices carry to the work areas on both the second and top floors.
- h. Restrooms: We have only one men's restroom which is on the top floor. We converted the men's restroom on the second floor to another ladies' restroom. There are NO employee restrooms on the bottom floor.
- i. Square footage: Although we have 211 square feet per employee, much of that space is wasted or unusable space. More than half of our worker *offices* are cubicles, which compromises confidentiality and privacy. The cubicle walls are only 5 ½ ' tall and are merely stand-up partitions that do not absorb sounds or conversations. There are no doors on the cubicles. If we were to receive State funding with which to hire more workers (**which we desperately need since our caseloads have more than doubled in the past several years**), we absolutely **do not** have space to put them. We have our Computer Technician in a room that was supposed to be the room for computer, telephone, and security systems. That room is not heated or cooled. We have 2 Social

Workers in one small office; and 3 employees in another (Fraud Investigator and 2 Social Workers). Both of our Eligibility Screeners are in makeshift offices (one includes a Clerk in the office also). Our Fuel/Cooling workers are in 6X6 cubbyholes that are hardly big enough for a desk and a chair. Although we've been creative in making space for offices, **we are now totally out of options!**

#### #7 Building Systems:

- c. and d. Heating & A/C: The antiquated heating and cooling systems are constantly in need of repair. These repairs alone are quite costly since we are responsible for paying the first \$1,000 of any repair bill. The City and County pay the overage.

#### #8 Client Service Impacts:

- a. Customer Parking: Customers have been instructed to park in the lower two parking areas marked as "Social Services Parking". However, most of them park in the Jefferson Plaza Parking lot directly adjacent to our building in spite of the fact that there are signs stating it is not DSS parking area. The businesses around us consider us to be "poor neighbors" because DSS customers insist on parking there for easier access to our building. We do not have ample handicapped parking spaces and no room to add more. See #3.
- b. Customer Waiting Areas: Our lobby is small and dimly lighted. In spite of our efforts to "cheer it up", it is a rather dismal entryway into our agency.
- c. Customer restrooms: We have one men's restroom and one ladies' restroom off the main lobby for customers. Neither of them is large enough for us to install baby changing stations.

Our current building demands a good deal of our time, energy and money. It is a burden to all who either receive benefits and services here or those who work here. The issues in this survey and other building issues are addressed in our 2004 Building Facility Needs Assessment (to be sent to you). Since that assessment was completed, the conditions have worsened. We can only expect that to continue. This building is almost 70 years old and is structurally unsound. Every day the safety of our customers and employees is jeopardized by the hazards within and directly around this building. Not only is the building too small for the number of employees we have, but it is also unsafe, unsanitary, and an embarrassment to our community.

Our current amount of State administrative funding earmarked for payment of rent is \$29,436 per year. This equates to approximately \$1.43 per square foot. In order to meet the needs of our customers and employees we need a better facility with funding that is more comparable to that of surrounding city and county social services.

As one of the best Social Services agencies in the State of Virginia, it is imperative that we have adequate housing in which to work and grow so that we may continue quality customer service delivery. We hope and pray that the local governments, the State Department, and our Legislators will recognize our plight and provide the necessary funding to alleviate our severe housing conditions.

**Locality Name: Louisa County**

**FIPS Code: 109**

One of the issues which is not addressed in this survey and I feel needs to be addressed is the matter of general reimbursement for office space costs.

Last FY, I needed to lease additional space next door to house most of my child welfare staff (10 folks). Our current location was full. I received no additional reimbursement from the state to cover this increased cost. Fortunately, the space was available and at a very reasonable price however no additional funds were forthcoming. Are there procedures to acquire additional reimbursement (80/20 monies) to assist localities with their office space needs?

**Locality Name: Madison County**

**FIPS Code: 113**

Our county remodeled a former bank property they purchased. We moved into this space in 1998, which doubled our space from 2,500 square feet to about 5,000 square feet. There is no way we could conduct business in our former privately leased space!

We are fortunate to have individual offices for our staff, as well as a break room, Board conference/meeting room, a nice lobby/waiting room, and some storage space. The Board room is where FAPT, CPMT, DSS Board, Community Action Agency, Health Families, elderly coalition, and other human service groups meet. With all of the new foster care cases the J & DR Court are sending our way, it takes several rooms to meet with the families, explain foster care, and be a "holding area" for children and families.

We have not gotten enough administrative funds to keep pace with the cost of doing business, and it has fallen to our local government to pick up the difference. I know there are many agencies that would meet the "slum" criteria, and that has such a detrimental effect on the clients as well as the staff. Those agencies are a priority in space and funding, but let's not forget to reimburse the localities that have stepped in to help their DSS and ultimately the county citizens.

**Locality Name: Pulaski County**

**FIPS Code: 155**

I have tried to provide as accurate as possible answers requested on the data collection spreadsheet. I would also like to provide some additional comments to put my answers into perspective.

The Pulaski County Department of Social Services is located in the County Administration Building. The agency takes up approximately one half of the usable office space in the building. The agency is spread out over three floors. The administrative staff, including myself and four others is located about two about two blocks away in leased space. The County Administration Building is an old school building constructed in 1916. Although the County has re-modeled the building, it is grossly inadequate for our needs in serving citizens of Pulaski County. I receive regular complaints about the air quality and employee illnesses that are suggested to be related to that issue. There is no outside air brought into the HVAC system. The basement areas where our records are stored as well as housing offices for employment services and energy assistance staff are six feet below the 100 year flood level. The stair ways, located at each end of the building are the original wood construction and have no fire protection in case of

an emergency for staff to exit. The impact of the space on our efficiency and effectiveness in administering programs and services to citizens is significant.

The Board of Supervisors is trying to make other arrangements; however, having some additional state/federal revenue available to help with the new rent/lease costs, utilities, and maintenance would definitely provide increased incentive to proceed with a consolidated human services office complex.

**Locality Name: Harrisonburg-Rockingham County**

**FIPS Code: 165**

Harrisonburg Rockingham Social Services currently occupies two facilities. The main building located at 110 North Mason St. houses the agency plus the local health department. Data about staff and space can be found in the attached survey. Additional space is rented in the adjoining block in the Metro Building. Information about that space can also be found in the survey.

The agency is negotiating for additional space in the Metro Building to move crowded staff from the main building. The move to the anticipated space is scheduled for January or February 2007, or as soon as space is available after cosmetic renovation (painting and carpet). Anticipated costs and space information is within the attached survey.

For the last several years, the agency has been working with local government and our local Redevelopment Housing Authority to develop plans for a new facility to handle current and anticipated growth. Our goal is for the facility to house the agency, the local health department, and the local Community Services Board. Discussion has also occurred about the plans including other government and nonprofit service agencies.

Plans are in the preliminary stage at this time. It is hoped that actual facility construction can begin in 2007. Space for the agency's portion of the facility is projected at 80,000 square feet. At current construction costs, the price for the agency's portion would be \$6.5 to \$8 million.

**Locality Name: Russell County**

**FIPS Code: 167**

Below please find an outline of important facts regarding Russell County Department of Social Services' unique needs for facility improvement.

The Russell County Department of Social Services main building (referred to as DSS I) is not ADA compliant. It is a two story building with no elevator. None of the restrooms in the facility are wheel chair accessible. Most of the worker's offices are too small to accommodate a client or worker who is in a wheel chair.

Parking at the DSS I building is not adequate to meet the needs of staff and clients. Double parking all around the building creates hazardous conditions for people entering and exiting the parking lot and especially for pedestrians on their way in and out of the building.

There is not adequate space in the DSS I building to house all staff members. Because of this overcrowding the Russell County Department of Social Services has to rent a separate office space several miles away on the other side of town (referred to as DSS II). This creates logistical problems for staff members who have to work directly with each other to serve clients but are located in separate buildings. This also creates situations where some clients have to

drive back and forth between offices to take care of their business with the agency. In addition to the logistical problems the maintenance of two separate buildings creates significant added expense. Additional rent is expended for the second office space and the local agency has to pay for an extra phone system as well as an extra T1 line.

The DSS I facility was constructed in 1983 and no longer meets building standards and is in need of repair. The owners of the building seem unwilling to invest in making improvement to the building.

**Locality Name: Tazewell County**

**FIPS Code: 185**

In 1982 Tazewell County renovated an abandoned school building to house our Department, the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Juvenile Court Service Unit and the County's administrative offices.

In 1983 one local real estate agency estimated the life expectancy of the building at that time to be 14 years.

For a period of 20 years we paid only \$1,808.66 per month toward this amortization. At that time we had only 42 employees and some 10,000 square feet of space was allocated for our use.

Since then our department has been granted the space previously occupied by Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court and County Administration. However, since then our agency size has doubled and, as you can see, it is necessary for us to operate from, not only this facility, but two satellite offices as well. In our current facility, hallway space has been utilized to set up offices to accommodate our staff as well.

In addition, in the mid 1990's our current facility was identified as a "sick building". Attempts were made to alleviate some of the problems; however, these efforts could not resolve these problems and we continue to have problems to this date.

- (1) We do not anticipate making a payment to the County for our current facility since the amortization period has lapsed.
- (2) If it were possible for sufficient improvements to be made to our facility, we would be responsible for the cost of those improvements.

The anticipated annual cost increase is based on current estimates of the cost of a new "Community Facilities" building which the county has plans for at this time. The two satellite offices will be incorporated into this facility eliminating the need for rental property.

**Locality Name: Wythe County**

**FIPS Code: 197**

Part of the problem that I have in my current space, is that it is very poorly designed and non-conducive, given the current structural design, to efficient work flow and utilization of the space. In fact, it was never intended to be an office building—one section was a private residence, built in 1920's, which has been added to on a couple of occasions over the years, attached by a corridor to a building designed to be a college classroom building in the 1960's. There is much

unusable space because of the original designs. Even though the space occupied totals 10,377 square feet, there are large foyers totally 100's of square feet and areas outside public restrooms of 300-400 square feet that are currently not usable for agency service delivery. Confidentiality is basically non-existent. We need additional conference room spaces, an adequate staff lounge & kitchen, 2-3 family meeting rooms where we are asked to provide supervised "neutral" site visitations for court ordered family visits. We also have an approved Americorps position, which is not included in the approved staff number and we usually have 1-2 social work interns from Radford University School of Social Work or New River Community College Human Services Degree Program that need space as well—none of those are included in the approved staff numbers. The current elevator is non-handicapped accessible and most bathrooms are non-accessible. The current building is the greatest liability under which this department must operate and we desperately need a renovation and expansion.

Although I have pushed for a New Human Services Building that would co-locate DSS, Health, Mental Health, VEC and non-profit human service agencies, the county was just not willing to embrace that vision. So, what's happened is Mental Health, renovated and expanded its space, 7-8 of the non-profit human service agencies have co-located into the HOPE Ministry Center as a result of my work on the HOPE Board, and VEC continues to lease space in one of the area shopping centers. So, the opportunity for a consolidated Human Services Center has been missed. Finally, this year the county is beginning to actively consider a major renovation and expansion of our current space.

**Locality Name: Hampton County**

**FIPS Code: 650**

Hampton Department of Human Services is housed as a former high school which is not structurally designed to function as a center for human services. Some of the hindrances of the building's design are:

- Building square footage is largely made up of common area; hallways and staircases.
- Workers work areas are cubicles set up in classrooms. The areas are disproportioned and contained.
- Workers are required to interview in their work area, which eliminates privacy for the customer as well the worker. Also, the workers safety is at jeopardy (dissatisfied customer visit workers by surprise)
- Lights in the hallway were upgraded within the past two years, but the lights in the worker areas need upgrading.
- Windows are needed throughout the building. The windows leak when it rains and the outdoor temperature affects the heating/air conditioning in the building. All the windows do not close and/or lock. The first floor windows were estimated at \$1 million to replace.
- Certain repairs or modification can not adequately be made due to the uncertainty of asbestos.
- Inner office doors do not securely lock.
- Outer doors do not securely lock, chains are used for additional security (during off hours).

Roof leaks in varied areas from weather and heating/air conditioning systems.

**Locality Name: Norton City****FIPS Code: 720**

The agency has been renting space in this facility since 1992. The agency had grown since 1992 and the agency rented additional space on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the building we are currently in. Our Service Staff, Office Manager, VIEW Worker and 1 clerk are housed upstairs. The agency is separated by an entire floor. There is an elevator that is available, but it is very small and will barely fit a small wheelchair inside it. Being separated by an entire floor gives the appearance that there are two separate agencies to serve the public, and it also makes the staff feel that they are not part of the agency. The bottom floor houses the eligibility unit and 2 clerks and the Director. The eligibility workers offices have walls that do not go all the way to the ceiling and the offices are not very conducive to having confidential conversations. There are not private rooms to interview in. The bottom floor has 2 steps to go up to get the public restrooms. If someone is handicapped they must go outside the building and enter a side door to get to the restrooms. The restrooms on the bottom floor are not ADA compliant. There is not a fire alarm in the facility. Sprinklers are located on the first floor and another type of system is available on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. There are no break rooms for the staff. There is a very small conference room available, but we can not comfortably seat our entire staff in it. There is no security system on the premises. Parking is located close to the building, but if you park on the street there is a 2 hour limit and if violated, the fine is \$10.00. Free parking is available if space is available. The staff and customers have to compete with the other businesses down town for available parking spots. There is no back up electrical system if the power goes out for any length of time.

The City is aware of the space limitations, and is willing to help out if another building is available. Norton is a very small City and there are not many options available.